

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

First Named Inventor	: Maneesh Agrawala et al.	Confirmation No.: 7428
Appln. No.	: 10/788,503	Group Art Unit: 2178
Filed	: February 27, 2004	Examiner: David Faber
For	: HYPERTEXT NAVIGATION FOR SHARED DISPLAYS	
Docket No.	: M61.12-0607	

BRIEF FOR APPELLANT

FILED ELECTRONICALLY ON NOVEMBER 6, 2007

Sir:

This is an appeal from an Office Action dated February 23, 2007 in which claims 1-29 and 31-40 were finally rejected. The appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-29 and 31-40 are allowable, and request that the Board reverse the rejection of claims 1-29 and 31-40 and find that claims 1-29 and 31-40 are in condition for allowance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	3
STATUS OF THE CLAIMS	3
STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	3
SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	4
I. Introduction.....	4
II. Brief Background	4
III. The Claimed Subject Matter	5
A. Independent Claim 1 and Separately Argued Dependent Claim 10	5
B. Independent Claim 15 and Separately Argued Dependent Claim 17	5
C. Independent Claim 22 and Separately Argued Dependent Claim 26	6
D. Independent Claim 33	7
E. Independent Claim 38 and Separately Argued Dependent Claim 40	7
GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	8
ARGUMENT	9
I. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 14-16, 20-25, 27-28, 31, 33-34 and 37-39 under 35 USC §103(a).....	9
A. Claims 1-6 and 14.....	9
B. Claims 15-16 and 20-21.....	11
C. Claims 22-25, 27-28 and 31	11
D. Claims 33-34 and 37	12
E. Claims 38 and 39	12
II. Rejection of claims 7 and 9 under 35 USC §103(a).....	13
III. Rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC §103(a).....	13
IV. Rejection of claims 10-13, 17-19, 29, 35-36 and 40 under 35 USC §103(a)	13
A. Claim 10	13
B. Claim 17	14
C. Claim 40	14
V. Rejection of claim 26 under 35 USC §103(a)	15
VI. Rejection of claim 32 under 35 USC §103(a)	15
VII. CONCLUSION	15
Appendix A: Claims on Appeal	17
Appendix B: Evidence	26
Appendix C: Related Proceedings Appendix	27

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Microsoft Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Washington, and having offices at One Microsoft Way, Redmond, Washington 98052, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the chain of Assignments filed on February 27, 2004 and recorded on Reel 015032, frame 0868.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no known related appeals or interferences regarding the present appeal.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

- | | | |
|------|--|----------------|
| I. | Total number of claims in the application. | |
| | Claims in the application are: | 1-29 and 31-40 |
| II. | Status of all the claims. | |
| | A. Claims canceled: | 30 |
| | B. Claims withdrawn but not canceled: | 0 |
| | C. Claims pending: | 1-29 and 31-40 |
| | D. Claims allowed: | 0 |
| | E. Claims rejected: | 1-29 and 31-40 |
| | F. Claims objected to: | 0 |
| III. | Claims on appeal | |
| | The claims on appeal are: | 1-29 and 31-40 |

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An Amendment was filed after the mailing of the final rejection. Amendments were made in response to rejections to claims 1-29 and 31-40 under §112, second paragraph. The Examiner indicated, in the Advisory Action, that the Amendment was entered. Therefore, the Appellant believes the claim rejections under §112, second paragraph were withdrawn.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

I. Introduction

The invention relates to navigating and browsing hypertext documents. More particularly, the invention relates to navigating and browsing hypertext documents on an interactive shared display.

II. Brief Background

Shared displays are generally used to provide information to many viewers at the same time. Although viewers can view information from shared displays, most shared displays are not interactive. Even if a shared display is somewhat interactive, shared displays suffer from a variety of limitations. For example, portable input devices carried on a user, such as a PDAs or cell phones, usually have high latencies (i.e., require some sort of intermediary connection point for communication with other devices). In another example, portable input devices are difficult to use to transmit textual information. Even if a portable input device includes a pointing device, in general, there is no mechanism to transmit pointing device type information. In yet another example, often portable input devices can transmit information to other devices, but have no ability to receive information in response to the transmitted information from the other device. In addition, “web browsing” of hypertext documents is usually limited to a single individual interacting with a personal desktop or laptop computer. Therefore, browsing interfaces are designed and assumed to be accessible by a full keyboard and mouse. However, shared display environments typically do not offer such input methods. Instead, portable input devices need to be used.

III. The Claimed Subject Matter

A. Independent Claim 1 and Separately Argued Dependent Claim 10

Independent claim 1 provides a method of using a browsing system (300) to browse a hypertext document. The method includes converting (402) components in a hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags. See page 16, line 13 through page 17, line 9 of the Specification. The method includes controlling (404) a shared display module (308) to display the alternate component activation tags with the converted components in the hypertext document. See page 17, lines 10-22 of the Specification. The shared display module (308) is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users of which each user simultaneously interacting with different portable input devices (304). See page 15, lines 18-23 of the Specification. The method also includes activating (404) the converted components in the hypertext document displayed on the shared display module (308) by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tags from the different portable input devices (304) See page 17, line 23 through page 18, line 4 of the Specification. See also FIGS. 3 and 4 of the Specification.

Dependent claim 10 depends from claim 1 and further includes providing (602) a plurality of automated browsing modes to perform various navigational controls. See page 24, lines 7-19 of the Specification. The plurality of automated browsing modes are provided (604) with automated browsing activation tags. See page 24, line 19-29 of the Specification. The shared display module (308) is controlled to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users. See page 24, line 29 through page 25, line 14. The automated browsing modes are activated (606). See page 25, lines 15-20 of the Specification. See also FIGS. 3 and 6 of the Specification

B. Independent Claim 15 and Separately Argued Dependent Claim 17

Independent claim 15 provides a method of using a browsing system (300) to browse a hypertext document. The method includes providing (502) a plurality of browsing modes to perform various navigational commands. See page 21, line 21 through page 22, line 9 of the Specification. The method includes modifying (504) the plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags. See page 22, lines 10-17 of the Specification. The method

includes controlling a shared display module (308) to display the alternate browsing activation tags with the associated modified plurality of browsing modes. See page 22, lines 17-26 of the Specification. The display module (308) is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device (304). See page 15, lines 18-23 of the Specification. The method also includes activating (506) browsing modes displayed on the shared display module (308) by receiving input signals related to alternate browsing activation tags that are associated with the browsing modes from the different portable input devices (304). See page 22, line 27 through page 23, line 21 of the Specification. See also FIGS. 3 and 5 of the Specification.

Dependent claim 17 depends from claim 15 and further includes providing (502) a plurality of automated browsing modes to perform various automated navigational functions. See page 24, lines 7-19 of the Specification. The plurality of automated browsing modes are provided (604) with automated browsing activation tags. See page 24, lines 19-29 of the Specification. The shared display module (308) is controlled to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users. See page 24, line 29 through page 25, line 14. The automated browsing modes are activated (606). See page 25, line 15 through page 26, line 3 of the Specification. See also FIGS. 3 and 6 of the Specification.

C. Independent Claim 22 and Separately Argued Dependent Claim 26

Independent claim 22 provides a browsing system (300) for displaying a hypertext document on a display (310). The browsing system (300) includes a hypertext document converter (314) configured to convert components in the hypertext document to include alternate activation tags. See page 16, line 18 through page 17, line 9 of the Specification. The browsing system (300) includes a hypertext display controller (316) configured to instruct a shared display module (308) to display the alternate component activation tags with the converted components in the hypertext document. See page 17, lines 10-22 of the Specification. The shared display module (308) is viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with different portable input devices (304). See page 15, lines 18-23 of the Specification. The browsing system (300) also includes an input processor (318) configured to receive and process input signals related to the alternate component activation tags displayed on the shared display module (308) from the

different portable input devices (304). See page 17, line 23 through page 21, line 20 of the Specification. See also FIG. 3 of the Specification.

Dependent claim 26 depends from independent claim 22 and dependent claim 25 and further describes the input processor (318) has being further configured to implement a scheduling algorithm to process the different types of input signals received from the different portable input devices (304). See page 20, line 28 through page 21, line 10.

D. Independent Claim 33

Independent claim 33 provides a browsing system (300) for displaying a hypertext document on a display (310). The browsing system includes a mode controller (320) configured to modify a plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags. See page 21, line 21 through page 22, line 18 of the Specification. The browsing system (300) includes a hypertext display controller (316) configured to display the plurality of browsing modes and alternate browsing activation tags on a shared display module (308). See page 22, lines 19-26 of the Specification. The shared display module (308) is viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with different portable input devices (304). See page 14, line 28 through page 15, line 23 of the Specification. The browsing system (300) also includes an input processor (318) configured to receive and process input signals related to alternate browsing activation tags displayed on the shared display module (308) from the different portable input devices (304). See page 22, line 27 through page 24, line 2 of the Specification. See also FIG. 3 of the Specification.

E. Independent Claim 38 and Separately Argued Dependent Claim 40

Independent claim 38 provides a computer-readable medium containing computer executable instructions for implementing certain steps. One of the steps includes converting (402) components in a hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags represented by symbols. See page 16, line 13 through page 17, line 9 of the Specification. Another step includes controlling (404) a shared display (310) to display the symbols representing the converted components. See page 17, lines 10-22 of the Specification. The shared display (310) is viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input

device (304). See page 14, line 28 through page 15, line 23 of the Specification. Yet another step includes activating (404) the converted components by receiving and processing input signals related to the symbols displayed on the shared display (310) from the different portable input devices (304). See page 17, line 23 through page 18, line 4 of the Specification. See also FIGS. 3 and 4 of the Specification.

Dependent claim 40 depends from independent claim 38 and further includes providing (602) a plurality of automated browsing modes. See page 24, lines 7-19 of the Specification. The plurality of automated browsing modes are provided (604) with automated browsing activation tags. Each automated browsing activation tag is represented by a symbol. See page 24, line 19-29 of the Specification. The shared display (310) is controlled to display the plurality of automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users. See page 24, line 29 through page 25, line 14. Browsing modes are activated (606) by receiving and processing symbols. See page 25, lines 15-20 of the Specification. See also FIGS. 3 and 6 of the Specification.

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

I. Whether claims 1-6, 14-16, 20-25, 27-28, 31, 33-34 and 37-39 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,594,348 issued to Bjurstrom et al. (hereafter referred to as “Bjurstrom et al.”) in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0107888 issued to Chiu et al. (hereafter referred to as Chiu et al.) and in further view of International Publication No. WO 03/083717 issued to Buckley et al. (hereafter referred to as Buckley et al.).

II. Whether claims 7 and 9 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bjurstrom et al. in further view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,912,326 issued to Lai et al. (hereafter referred to as Lai et al.).

III. Whether claim 8 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bjurstrom et al. in further view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al., in further view of Lai et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,708,825 issued to Sotomayor (hereafter referred to as Sotomayor).

IV. Whether claims 10-13, 17-19, 29, 35-36 and 40 are unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,655 issued to Borman et al. (hereafter referred to as Borman et al.).

V. Whether claim 26 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al. and further in view of Andrew S. Tanenbaum, “Modern Operating Systems” (hereafter referred to as Tanenbaum).

VI. Whether claim 32 is unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al. and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0052000 issued to Giacalone, Jr. (hereafter referred to as Giacalone, Jr.).

ARGUMENT

Claims 1-29 and 31-40 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) with various combinations of the cited references. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *In re Vaeck*, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); M.P.E.P. §2143.

The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. “To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

I. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 14-16, 20-25, 27-28, 31, 33-34 and 37-39 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Final Office Action indicated that claims 1-6, 14-16, 20-25, 27-28, 31, 33-34 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in further view of Chiu et al. and in further view of Buckley et al.

A. Claims 1-6 and 14

Appellant respectfully submits that there is insufficient evidence to establish a *prima facie*

case of obviousness in independent claim 1. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references fails to teach or suggest, expressly or impliedly, all of the elements recited in independent claim 1. In particular, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest “activating the converted components in a hypertext document on the shared display module by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tags from the different portable input devices.”

Bjurstrom et al. discloses associating elements of a HTML page to DMTF tones and implementing a function on a HTML page in response to receiving DMTF tones from a telephone (see col. 5, line 54 to col. 9, line 67). Chiu et al. discloses displaying symbols next to hyperlinks so that a user can operate the hyperlink by using a numeric key. None of the references disclose the activation of converted components in the hypertext document displayed on the shared display module (which is viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device) based on the receipt of input signals related to the converted components from the different portable input devices. Although a plurality of users can view a television (as in Chiu et al.) and a remote control can control items on the television screen or a shared display screen can be associated with input devices (as in Buckley et al.), such displays do not allow for the activation of components or alternate component activation tags on the display by different portable input devices of which each user viewing the display is simultaneously interacting with as is claimed in claim 1.

In the continuation sheet of the Advisory Action dated April 13, 2007, the Examiner states that the claims state “the user’s input device don’t (sic) interact with the shared displayed (sic), just that the user is interacting with their portable input device, and that the shared display device is viewable by the same time by at (sic) all.” The Appellant respectfully disagrees. The third element of claim 1 clearly states that input signals from different portable input devices (which were interacted with by users) activate converted components in the hypertext document displayed on the shared display. Clearly, portable input devices interact with the shared display to receive input signals from them to cause activation.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-6 and 14 are also not obvious in view of the cited references as depending on allowable base claim 1.

B. Claims 15-16 and 20-21

Appellant respectfully submits that there is insufficient evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in independent claim 15. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references fails to teach or suggest, expressly or impliedly, all of the elements recited in independent claim 15. In particular, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest “activating browsing modes displayed on the shared display module by receiving input signals related to alternate browsing activation tags that are associated with the browsing modes from the different portable input devices.”

As discussed above in regards to claim 1, although a television (as in Chiu et al.) can be viewed by two or more people and a shared display screen can be associated with input devices (as in Buckley et al.), such a display does not allow for the activation of browsing modes by different portable input devices of which each of a plurality of users is simultaneously interacting with as is claimed in claim 15.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 15 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 15. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16 and 20-21 are also not obvious in view of the cited references as depending on allowable base claim 15.

C. Claims 22-25, 27-28 and 31

Appellant respectfully submits that there is insufficient evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in independent claim 22. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references fails to teach or suggest, expressly or impliedly, all of the elements recited in independent claim 22. In particular, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest “an input processor configured to receive and process input signals related to the alternate component activation tags displayed on the shared display module from the different portable input devices.”

As discussed above, although a television (as in Chiu et al.) can be viewed by two or more people and a shared display screen can be associated with input devices (as in Buckley et al.), such a display does not allow for the receipt and processing of input signals related to converted components displayed to a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a

different portable input device as is claimed in claim 22.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 22 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 22. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 23-25, 27-28 and 31 are also not obvious in view of the cited references as depending on allowable base claim 22.

D. Claims 33-34 and 37

Appellant respectfully submits that there is insufficient evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in independent claim 33. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references fails to teach or suggest, expressly or impliedly, all of the elements recited in independent claim 33. In particular, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest “an input processor configured to receive and process input signals related to alternate browsing activation tags displayed on the shared display module from the different portable input devices.”

As discussed above, although a television (as disclosed in Chiu et al.) can be viewed by two or more people and a shared display screen can be associated with input devices (as in Buckley et al.), such a display does not allow for the receipt and processing of input signals related to converted browsing modes displayed to a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input devices as is claimed in claim 33.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 33 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 33. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 34 and 37 are also not obvious in view of the cited references as depending on allowable base claim 33.

E. Claims 38 and 39

Appellant respectfully submits that there is insufficient evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in independent claim 38. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references fails to teach or suggest, expressly or impliedly, all of the elements recited in independent claim 33. In particular, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest “activating the converted components by receiving and processing input signals related to the symbols displayed on the shared display from the different portable input devices.”

As discussed above, although a television (as disclosed in Chiu et al.) can be viewed by two or more people and a shared display screen can be associated with input devices (as in Buckley et al.), such a display does not allow for the activation of converted components displayed to a plurality of users by a the different input devices as is claimed in claim 38.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 38 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 38. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claim 39 is also not obvious in view of the cited references as depending on allowable base claim 38.

II. Rejection of claims 7 and 9 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Final Office Action indicated that claims 7 and 9 were unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in further view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al. and in further view of Lai et al. It is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 9 are in condition for allowance at least based on their dependency on allowable claim 1.

III. Rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Final Office Action indicated that claim 8 was unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in further view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al., in further view of Lai et al. and in further view of Sotomayor. It is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is in condition for allowance at least based on its dependency on allowable claim 1.

IV. Rejection of claims 10-13, 17-19, 29, 35-36 and 40 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Final Office Action indicated that claims 10-13, 17-19, 29, 35-36 and 40 were unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al. and in further view of Borman et al. It is respectfully submitted that claims 10-13, 17-19, 29, 35-36 and 40 are in condition for allowance at least based on their dependency on allowable claims 1, 15, 22, 33 and 38.

A. Claim 10

Claim 10 is not obvious, at the very least, for the rationales provided above. However, it is

believed that the rejection to claim 10 was improper for additional reasons. In particular, the cited references fail to teach or suggest “controlling the shared display module to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users” as claimed in claim 10. The Examiner, in the Final Office Action, cites the automated navigation features in Borman et al. However, the Examiner fails to show that the shared display module is controlled to display automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 10 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of claim 10.

B. Claim 17

Claim 17 is not obvious, at the very least, for the rationales provided above. However, it is believed that the rejection to claim 17 was improper for additional reasons. In particular, the cited references fail to teach or suggest “controlling the shared display module to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users” as claimed in claim 17. As discussed in regards to claim 10, the Examiner, in the Final Office Action, cites the automated navigation features in Borman et al. However, the Examiner fails to show that the shared display module is controlled to display automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 17 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of claim 17.

C. Claim 40

Claim 40 is not obvious, at the very least, for the rationales provided above. However, it is believed that the rejection to claim 40 was improper for additional reasons. In particular, the cited references fail to teach or suggest “controlling the shared display module to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users” as claimed in claim 40. As discussed in regards to claims 10 and 17, the Examiner, in the Final Office Action, cites the automated navigation features in Borman et al. However, the Examiner fails to show that

the shared display module is controlled to display automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 40 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of claim 40.

V. Rejection of claim 26 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Final Office Action indicated that claim 26 was unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al. and further in view of Tanenbaum. It is respectfully submitted that claim 26 is in condition for allowance at least based on their dependency on allowable claim 22. However, it is believed that the rejection to claim 40 was improper for additional reasons. In particular, the cited references fail to teach or suggest that “the input processor is further configured to process different types of input signals received from the different portable input devices in an order” as claimed in claim 26. The Examiner, the Final Office Action, cites the scheduling algorithms in Tannenbaum that schedules which process to run next based on various factors, such as shortest job first or first come first served. Tannenbaum fails to disclose processing different types of input signals et along in an order.

At least for these reasons, the Appellant submits that claim 26 is not obvious in view of the cited references, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejection of claim 26.

VI. Rejection of claim 32 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Final Office Action indicated that claim 32 was unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al. in view of Chiu et al., in further view of Buckley et al. and in further view of Giacalone, Jr. It is respectfully submitted that claim 32 is in condition for allowance at least based on its dependency on allowable claim 22.

VII. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-29 and 31-40 are neither taught nor suggested by the reference cited by the Examiner nor has the Examiner

presented a convincing line of reasoning as to why an artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the reference. Thus, Appellant respectfully request that the Board reverse the Examiner and find all pending claims allowable.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Leanne Taveggia Farrell/
Leanne Taveggia Farrell, Reg. No. 53,675
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

LTF/jmt

Appendix A: Claims on Appeal

1. A method of using a browsing system to browse a hypertext document, the method comprising:
converting components in a hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags;
controlling a shared display module to display the alternate component activation tags with the converted components in the hypertext document, wherein the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with different portable input devices; and
activating the converted components in the hypertext document displayed on the shared display module by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tags from the different portable input devices.
2. The method of claim 1, wherein converting components in a hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags further comprises parsing the hypertext document to identify hyperlinks and open fields.
3. The method of claim 1, further comprising processing different types of input signals from the different portable input devices into a form that the browsing system can recognize.
4. The method of claim 1, wherein activating the converted components of the hypertext document by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tags comprises activating the converted components by receiving alphanumeric symbols that represent the alternate component activation tags.

5. The method of claim 1 and further comprising:
providing a plurality of browsing modes to perform various navigational commands;
modifying the plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags;
controlling the shared display module to display the alternate browsing activation tags with
the associated modified plurality of browsing modes to the plurality of users; and
activating browsing modes displayed on the shared display module by receiving input
signals related to alternate browsing activation tags that are associated with the
browsing modes from the different portable input devices.
6. The method of claim 5, wherein activating browsing modes by receiving input signals
related to alternate browsing activation tags that are associated with the browsing modes comprises
activating the browsing modes by receiving alphanumeric symbols that represent the particular
alternate browsing activation tags.
7. The method of claim 1 and further comprising abbreviating the hypertext document such
that display space needed in displaying the hypertext document is reduced.
8. The method of claim 7, wherein abbreviating the hypertext document comprises
automatically summarizing text in the hypertext document.
9. The method of claim 7, wherein abbreviating the hypertext document comprises
automatically reducing image media content in the hypertext document.

10. The method of claim 1 and further comprising:
providing a plurality of automated browsing modes to perform various navigational controls;
providing the plurality of automated browsing modes with automated browsing activation tags;
controlling the shared display module to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users; and
activating automated browsing modes.
11. The method of claim 10 and further comprising deactivating automated browsing modes by receiving a command from the different portable input devices.
12. The method of claim 10, wherein activating automated browsing modes comprises activating the automated browsing modes by receiving input signals related to automated browsing activation tags associated with the automated browsing modes from the different portable input devices.
13. The method of claim 12, wherein activating automated browsing modes by receiving input signals related to automated browsing activation tags associated with the automated browsing modes comprises activating automated browsing modes by receiving alphanumeric symbols that represent the automated browsing activation tags.
14. The method of claim 1 and further comprising annotating the hypertext document with a unique code such that the input signal is associated with the hypertext document.

15. A method of using a browsing system to browse a hypertext document, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of browsing modes to perform various navigational commands;

modifying the plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags;

controlling a shared display module to display the alternate browsing activation tags with the associated modified plurality of browsing modes, wherein the display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device; and

activating browsing modes displayed on the shared display module by receiving input signals related to alternate browsing activation tags that are associated with the browsing modes from the different portable input devices.

16. The method of claim 15, wherein activating browsing modes by receiving input signals related to alternate browsing activation tags that are associated with the browsing modes comprises activating the browsing modes by receiving alphanumeric symbols that represent the alternate browsing activation tags.

17. The method of claim 15 and further comprising:

providing a plurality of automated browsing modes to perform various automated navigational functions;

providing the plurality of automated browsing modes with automated browsing activation tags;

controlling the shared display module to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users; and

activating automated browsing modes.

18. The method of claim 17, wherein activating automated browsing modes comprises activating the automated browsing modes by receiving input signals related to automated browsing activation tags from the different portable input devices.

19. The method of claim 18, wherein activating automated browsing modes by receiving input signals related to automated browsing activation tags comprises activating the automated browsing modes by receiving alphanumeric symbols that represent the automated browsing activation tags.

20. The method of claim 15 and further comprising:
converting components in the hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags;
controlling the shared display module to display the alternate component activation tags with the converted components in the hypertext document to the plurality of users;
and
activating the converted components of the hypertext document by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tags from the different portable input devices.

21. The method of claim 20, wherein activating the components of the hypertext document by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tags comprises activating the components of the hypertext document by receiving alphanumeric symbols that represent the alternate component activation tags.

22. A browsing system for displaying a hypertext document on a display comprising:
a hypertext document converter configured to convert components in the hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags;
a hypertext display controller configured to instruct a shared display module to display the alternate component activation tags with the converted components in the hypertext document, wherein the shared display module is viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with different portable input devices; and
an input processor configured to receive and process input signals related to the alternate component activation tags displayed on the shared display module from the different portable input devices.
23. The browsing system of claim 22, wherein the input signals received by the input processor are associated with alphanumerical symbols.
24. The browsing system of claim 22, wherein the input processor further comprises an output module configured to receive data from the hypertext display controller and output data to the different portable input devices.
25. The browsing system of claim 22, wherein the input processor is further configured to process different types of input signals received from the different portable input devices into forms that the browsing system can recognize.
26. The browsing system of claim 25, wherein the input processor is further configured to implement a scheduling algorithm to process the different types of input signals received from the different portable input devices in an order.
27. The browsing system of claim 22 wherein the different portable input devices comprise cell phones or personal data assistants (PDAs).
28. The browsing system of claim 22 and further comprising a mode controller configured to

modify a plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags.

29. The browsing system of claim 22 and further comprising a mode controller configured to provide a plurality of automated browsing modes with automated browsing activation tags.

31. The browsing system of claim 22, wherein the display comprises multiple screens.

32. The browsing system of claim 22, wherein the display includes a status display indicating status and historical information related to the input signals from the different portable input devices.

33. browsing system for displaying a hypertext document on a display comprising:
a mode controller configured to modify a plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags;
a hypertext display controller configured to display the plurality of browsing modes and alternate browsing activation tags on a shared display module, wherein the shared display module is viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with different portable input devices; and
an input processor configured to receive and process input signals related to alternate browsing activation tags displayed on the shared display module from the different portable input devices.

34. The browsing system of claim 33, wherein the plurality of browsing modes comprises a variety of navigational controls for browsing through hypertext documents.

35. The browsing system of claim 33, wherein the mode controller is further configured to provide a plurality of automated browsing modes with automated browsing activation tags.

36. The browsing system of claim 35, wherein the automated browsing modes comprise continuous scrolling of the hypertext document, continuous cycling through a plurality of hypertext documents, continuous random following of hyperlinks, automatic previewing of hypertext documents and continuous browsing of hyperlinks as specified by the different portable input devices.

37. The browsing system of claim 33 and further comprising a hypertext document converter configured to convert components in the hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags, wherein the hypertext display controller is further configured to instruct the display module to display the alternate component activation tags with the converted components in the hypertext document to the plurality of users.

38. A computer-readable medium containing computer executable instructions for implementing the steps of:

converting components in a hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags represented by symbols;

controlling a shared display to display the symbols representing the converted components, wherein the shared display is viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device; and

activating the converted components by receiving and processing input signals related to the symbols displayed on the shared display from the different portable input devices.

39. The computer-readable medium of claim 38 and further comprising the steps of:
providing a plurality of browsing modes;
modifying the plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags,
each alternate browsing activation tag represented by a symbol;
controlling the shared display to display the plurality of browsing modes and the alternate
browsing activation tags to the plurality of users; and
activating browsing modes by receiving and processing input signals from the different
portable input devices.
40. The computer-readable medium of claim 38 and further comprising the steps of:
providing a plurality of automated browsing modes;
providing the plurality of automated browsing modes with automated browsing activation
tags, each automated browsing activation tag represented by a symbol;
controlling the shared display module to display the plurality of automated browsing modes
and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users ; and
activating a browsing modes by receiving and processing symbols.

Appendix B: Evidence

There is no known evidence submitted pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132 or other evidence entered by the Examiner.

Appendix C: Related Proceedings Appendix

There are no known related appeals or interferences regarding the present appeal.